

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02127 01 OF 02 022032 Z

64

ACTION EUR-10

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ADP-00 PM-03 L-02 CIAE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00

RSC-01 NSC-10 IO-03 MBFR-02 SAJ-01 TRSE-00 PA-01

PRS-01 USIA-04 ACDA-10 AEC-05 NEA-06 OMB-01 GAC-01

NSCE-00 OIC-04 RSR-01 /091 W
----- 088790

P R 021850 Z MAY 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9920

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 2916

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

USNMR SHAPE

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 2127

LIMDIS

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: NAC DISCUSSION OF PAPER ON U. S. APPROACH TO
MBFR; MAY 2

HELSINKI FOR USDEL MPT

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

BEGIN SUMMARY: COUNCIL WAS UNANIMOUS IN EXPRESSING APPRECIATION
FOR CLARITY AND PRECISION OF U. S. PAPER WHICH WAS GENERALLY
WELCOMED AS AN IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION TO ALLIANCE CONSULTATION
ON MBFR. GIVEN RECENT DISTRIBUTION OF U. S. PAPER, NO REPRESENTA-
TIVE WAS ABLE TO ADDRESS SUBSTANCE ON INSTRUCTIONS AND DISCUSSION
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02127 01 OF 02 022032 Z

LARGELY CENTERED ON PROCEDURAL MODALITIES AND TOPICS FOR ALLIANCE
CONSULTATION BEFORE AND AFTER MINISTERIAL MEETINGS. FURTHER
COUNCIL DISCUSSION OF U. S. PAPER WILL TAKE PLACE AFTERNOON
OF MAY 10. END SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCING MBFR ITEM ON AGENDA, SYG LUNS EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR "REMARKABLE" U. S. CONTRIBUTION WHICH HE FELT DESERVED CAREFUL STUDY AS BASIS FOR BROADER ALLIANCE DIALOGUE ON SECURITY. HE NOTED U. S. PAPER DID NOT REPRESENT FINAL VIEWS OF U. S. HE CONGRATULATED AUTHORS OF PAPER FOR CLARITY AND PRECISION THEREOF AND FELT PAPER WOULD BE OF "MAJOR ASSISTANCE" TO NAC IN DISCUSSING MBFR. LUNS STRESSED SENSITIVITY OF CONTENT AND WARNED THAT ANY LEAKS WOULD BE EXTREMELY REGRETTABLE. HE THEN GAVE FLOOR TO AMB. RUMSFELD FOR STATEMENT (TEXT SEPTEL) WHICH WAS CIRCULATED AT CONCLUSION OF HIS REMARKS.

2. AFTER RUMSFELD STATEMENT, MENZIES (CANADA) PRAISED CLARITY AND PRECISION OF U. S. PAPER AND EXPRESSED GRATITUDE TO U. S. FOR "CONSTRUCTIVE AND HELPFUL" CONTRIBUTION. ON PERSONAL BASIS, HE OBSERVED THAT DIALOGUE WITH WARSAW PACT CONSTITUTED IN ITSELF A KIND OF "CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURE" AND THEREFORE WOULD HAVE SOME IMPACT ON CSCE TREATMENT OF BASKET I. HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE U. S. WANTED MILITARY SECURITY KEPT OUT OF CSCE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE BUT POINTED OUT THAT THERE WAS AN UNDENIABLE RELATIONSHIP. MENZIES ALSO WONDERED WHETHER THERE MIGHT NOT BE ROLE FOR NEUTRALS IN SOME ASPECTS OF INSPECTION VERIFICATION OF MBFR MEASURES AND SUGGESTED NAC DISCUSS THIS POSSIBILITY. CONCLUDING, HE WONDERED HOW SOVIETS COULD BE INDUCED TO ACCEPT LARGER MANPOWER CUTS THAN NATO ON BASIS OF U. S. MODEL AND SUGGESTED THAT MORE EXTENSIVE ANALYSIS OF SOVIET OBJECTIVES AND INCENTIVES IN MBFR MIGHT BE USEFUL IN SHAPING DIFFERENT NEGOTIATING APPROACHES IN TERMS OF THEIR RELATIVE ATTRACTIVENESS TO WP.

3. RUMSFELD AGREED THAT SOME ROLE IN VERIFICATION MIGHT OCCUR TO NON-MBFR COUNTRIES AND SUPPORTED MENZIES IDEA THAT IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE AND KEEP IN MIND SOVIET MOTIVES AS REGARD THE MBFR OUTCOMES THEY MIGHT SEE AS DESIRABLE. HE NOTED THIS WOULD BE ESPECIALLY TRUE AFTER ALLIES HAD AGREED ON PREFERRED WESTERN OUTCOME AND NATO
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02127 01 OF 02 022032 Z

BEGAN DISCUSSING NEGOTIATING TACTICS.

4. BELGIAN REP SAID U. S. PAPER OBVIOUSLY DESERVED CAREFUL STUDY AND WAS UNDER INTENSIVE REVIEW BY HIS AUTHORITIES AND EXPERTS. PECK (UK) EXPRESSED GRATITUDE FOR CLARITY OF U. S. PAPER DESPITE COMPLICATED SUBJECT MATTER AND FOR RUMSFELD EXPOSITION OF U. S. POSITION. HE WELCOMED U. S. ASSURANCES REGARDING NATO CONSULTATION AND RECOGNITION IN U. S. PAPER THAT ALLIES MUST KEEP TOGETHER DESPITE OCCASIONAL DIVERGENCES WHICH WOULD ARISE. PECK EMPHASIZED THAT ALLIANCE MUST BE CLEAR ON DISTINCTION BETWEEN PREFERRED OUTCOMES AND OPENING NEGOTIATING POSITION. HE HOPED THERE WOULD BE PLENTY OF "FAT" IN THE LATTER IN ORDER TO ENHANCE ALLIED NEGOTIATING

POSITION. HE AGREED WITH MENZIES THAT IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO
" CON" SOVIETS INTO LARGER NUMERICAL REDUCTIONS THAN NATO AND
PREDICTED THAT THE PROCESS WOULD BE A LONG ONE REQUIRING
PATIENCE ON PART OF ALL CONCERNED.

5. SPIERENBURG (NETH.) THANKED RUMSFELD FOR CLEAR STATEMENT
OF U. S. POSITION. HE SAID HE HOPED THAT U. S. FORCES WOULD
ONLY BE WITHDRAWN AND NOT DISBANDED. HE ASKED
WHETHER U. S. WANTED AGREEMENT ON GUIDELINES AT MINISTERIAL
MEETINGS AND IF SO WHETHER NAC SHOULD DISCUSS PRINCIPLES SET
FORTH IN U. S. PAPER. RUMSFELD REPLIED THAT HIS COMMENTS ON
COUNCIL AND MINISTERIAL ACTION WERE INTENDED AS SUGGESTIONS
FOR NAC CONSIDERATION. HE SUGGESTED NAC DISCUSS PREFERRED
OUTCOMES FULLY AND CAREFULLY AS NECESSARY PREREQUISITE FOR
PROGRESS AND THAT AT SOME POINT IN THIS DIALOGUE IT WOULD BE
DESIRABLE TO DISCUSS PRINCIPLES. HE NOTED THAT
AGREEMENT ON PRINCIPLES WOULD BE HELPFUL IN ANALYSING PRE-
FERRED OUTCOMES AND IN DEALING WITH THE OTHER SIDE DURING
NEGOTIATIONS AND INFORMAL CONTACTS.

6. BUSCH (NORWAY) ASKED FOR U. S. VIEWS ON PRE- AND POST-
MINISTERIAL SCENARIO FOR CONSULTATION, AND SPECIFICALLY
WHETHER NAC SHOULD PREPARE PRELIMINARY REPORT FOR MINISTERS
OR SIMPLY SAY THAT COUNCIL STILL STUDYING AND DISCUSSING U. S.
POSITION. RUMSFELD SAID U. S. HAD NO BLUEPRINT FOR THIS
BUT SUGGESTED NAC DISCUSS BOTH PRINCIPLES AND PREFERRED
OUTCOMES.

RUMSFELD

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 02127 01 OF 02 022032 Z

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 NATO 02127 02 OF 02 022127 Z

64

ACTION EUR-10

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ADP-00 PM-03 L-02 CIAE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00

RSC-01 NSC-10 IO-03 MBFR-02 SAJ-01 TRSE-00 PA-01

PRS-01 USIA-04 ACDA-10 AEC-05 NEA-06 OMB-01 GAC-01

NSCE-00 OIC-04 RSR-01 /091 W

----- 089357

P R 021850 Z MAY 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9921

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 2917

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH
USLOSACLANT
USNMR SHAPE
AMEMBASSY HELSINKI
AMEMBASSY VIENNA

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 2127

LIMDIS

7. KRAPF (FRG), NOTING THAT U. S. HAD INDICATED ITS WILLINGNESS TO ARRANGE FOR EXPERTS SESSION, SUGGESTED THAT THIS TAKE PLACE AFTER MINISTERIAL IN VIEW OF SHORT TIME REMAINING BEFORE COPENHAGEN MEETING. RUMSFELD INDICATED THAT IF COUNCIL, MILITARY COMMITTEE, SPC OR EXPERTS FROM CAPITALS WANTED A SESSION WITH U. S. EXPERTS, U. S. WOULD BE HAPPY TO COOPERATE. HE SAID U. S. WOULD NOT WANT TO RULE OUT AN EARLY SESSION; EXPERTS COULD MEET AT A LATER DATE IF THAT WERE THE WISH OF COUNCIL, BUT OUR EXPECTATION WAS THAT EXPERTS MIGHT MEET THIS MONTH. KRAPF POINTED OUT THAT AN EXPERTS SESSION MIGHT DRAW SOME OFFICIALS AWAY FROM VIENNA AT A TIME WHEN THE AD HOC GROUP WAS PARTICULARLY OCCUPIED, BUT LUNS POINTED OUT THAT DIFFERENT EXPERTS COULD BE MADE AVAILABLE.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02127 02 OF 02 022127 Z

8. ON A PERSONAL BASIS, GEN. STEINHOFF (CHAIRMAN MC) SUPPORTED EMPHASIS IN U. S. PAPER ON INITIAL REDUCTIONS IN STATIONED FORCES ONLY, WELCOMED U. S. ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY AND PREFERENCE FOR COMMON CEILING. HE URGED THAT ALLIANCE PUSH AHEAD ACTIVELY ON AD-70 FORCE IMPROVEMENTS. ON PROCEDURAL HANDLING, GEN. STEINHOFF OBSERVED THAT U. S. MODELS WOULD HAVE TO BE CONSIDERED IN DEPTH AND SUGGESTED THAT SACEUR BE ASKED TO PROVIDE A STUDY ON SECURITY ASPECTS OF THE THREE OUTCOMES, FOLLOWING WHICH THE MILITARY COMMITTEE COULD EXAMINE THEM IN DETAIL, PARTICULARLY NUCLEAR ASPECTS.

9. RETURNING TO PRINCIPLES, PECK WARNED THAT IN VIEW OF THE SENSITIVITY OF THE SUBJECT MINISTERS SHOULD BE ADVISED AGAINST GIVING FULL EXPOSITION OF PRINCIPLES IN COMMUNIQUE, A REVELATION WHICH COULD ONLY BENEFIT THE OTHER SIDE. RUMSFELD SUPPORTED THIS, NOTING THAT BY FAR THE GREATER PART OF PRINCIPLES SECTION SHOULD BE FOR INTERNAL CONSUMPTION ONLY AND PUBLIC AIRING OF PRINCIPLES WOULD PUT NATO A GREAT DISADVANTAGE. AS REGARDS AD HOC GROUP REPS' PARTICIPATION IN NATO CONSULTATIVE PROCESS, RUMSFELD SUGGESTED THAT AGH WORK WAS SOMEWHAT SEPARABLE FROM NAC CONSULTATION AT THIS STAGE AND THAT THERE DID NOT SEEM TO BE A NEED TO INVOLVE AHG TOO HEAVILY IN DISCUSSING THE BORADER SUBSTANTIVE SUBJECTS OF OUTCOMES AND PRINCIPLES NOW.

10 SUMMING UP, SYG SUGGESTED THAT BETWEEN NOW AND MINISTERIAL,

ALLIES SHOULD CONSIDER MAIN OBJECTIVES OF MBFR IN FORM OF U. S. OPTIONS PLUS ANY OTHERS THAT MIGHT BE ADVANCED. HE NOTED THAT THIS WAS AN EMBITIOUS PROGRAM BUT URGED COUNCIL TO MAKE AS MUCH HEADWAY AS POSSIBLE SO THAT AREAS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT COULD BE SPECIFIED FOR MINISTERIAL CONSIDERATION AND FURTHER DISCUSSION OF DISAGREED AREAS. HE SUGGESTED NAC MEET FOR INSTRUCTED DISCUSSION OF U. S. PAPER WITHIN NEXT WEEK OR TWO IN FRAMEWORK OF PO/(73) 13 ON UNRESOLVED ISSUES, AND THAT CHAIRMAN MC IDEA FOR SACEUR EVALUATION ALSO BE DISCUSSED AT THAT TIME. RUMSFELD NOTED THAT MOST ISSUES IN PO HAD BEEN ADDRESSED IN U. S. PAPER AND THOSE THAT WERE NOT FOR THE MOST PART BEST EXAMINED AFTER AGREEMENT ON PREFERRED OUTCOMES WHEN WE DISCUSS THE TACTICAL QUESTIONS.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02127 02 OF 02 022127 Z

11. GIVEN SHAPEX DATE (MAY 9) AND ANKARA NPG MINISTERIAL MAY 14-16, COUNCIL AGREED TO MEET AFTERNOON MAY 10 FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION OF U. S. PAPER.
RUMSFELD

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZ

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 02 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO02127
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730558/abqcdzls.tel
Line Count: 241
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <13-Aug-2001 by cunninfx>; APPROVED <18-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: NAC DISCUSSION OF PAPER ON U. S. APPROACH TO MBFR; MAY 2
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USLOSACLANT
USNMR SHAPE
HELSINKI

VIENNA

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005